

## FY 2005 Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program Guidance Changes from FY 2003

| Area                       | FY 2003  | FY 2005   |
|----------------------------|--|---|
| Appropriations             | Three grant programs: 1) non-competitive planning grants for certain states; 2) competitive Disaster Resistant University grants; and 3) competitive mitigation planning and project grants for states, Indian tribes, and local governments | Single grant program: competitive mitigation planning and project grants for states, territories, Indian tribes, communities, <i>and colleges and universities</i>  |
| Eligible Sub-applicants    | States, Indian tribes, and locals. Private non-profits not eligible but could apply through local.   | States, Indian tribes, locals, <i>and public universities</i> . Private non-profits are not eligible but may apply through local <i>or applicable state agency</i> .  |
| Plan Requirement           | No plan requirement was enforced since application period ended before November 1, 2004.   | State and local plans are required as condition of <i>receiving</i> project grants <i>by the date of selection for award – on or after May 1, 2005</i> .  |
| National Priority          | Projects addressing NFIP Repetitive Flood Loss Properties and Planning   | None  |
| NFIP Requirements          | All Applicants/Sub-applicants must be NFIP participating if mapped; projects must be located in NFIP-participating community if mapped by the NFIP.  | All Applicants/Sub-applicants must be NFIP participating if mapped; projects must be located in NFIP-participating community if mapped by the NFIP; <i>all jurisdictions included in multi-jurisdictional planning activities and projects must be NFIP participating if mapped</i> . |
| Other Program Requirements | Not addressed  | Projects must be geo-coded prior to award.  |
| Other Program Requirements | Not addressed  | Guidance regarding IRS taxation of mitigation projects will to be provided at a later date.   |
| Applications               | 3 month application period; applications submitted via e-Grants or on paper accepted   | <i>4 months</i> from guidance release to close of application period; applications must be submitted via e-Grants or <i>e-Grants paper application format</i>   |
| Management Costs           | Up to 10% Applicant management costs; up to 5% Sub-applicant management costs  | Up to 10% Applicant management costs; up to 5% Sub-applicant management costs; <i>Applicants may not apply for Sub-applicant management costs</i>   |
| Pre-Award Costs            | Pre-award costs are costs incurred prior to award and up to 6 months prior to NOFA.  | Pre-award costs are costs incurred prior to award and <i>after issuance of PDM guidance</i> .   |

### FY 2005 Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program Guidance Changes from FY 2003

| Area                          | FY 2003  | FY 2005   |
|-------------------------------|--|---|
| Planning Grants               | No funding cap; 2-year performance period  | \$3M Federal share funding cap, 3-year performance period   |
| Scope of Work & Cost Estimate | Not addressed  | Included extensive guidance on these topics. May require Applicants/Sub-applicants to submit revised BCA to ensure cost-effectiveness for project SOW changes.  |
| Eligible Projects             | Acquisition, relocation, structural and non-structural retrofitting, minor structural hazard control, localized flood control (safe rooms funded but not specifically addressed in guidance) | <i>Voluntary</i> acquisition and relocation, structural and non-structural retrofitting, minor structural hazard control, localized flood control, <i>construction of safe rooms, and generators for critical facilities</i>  |
| Ineligible Projects           | Major flood control, warning systems, phased or partial projects, flood studies or mapping, generators, response and communications equipment  | Major flood control, warning <i>and alert notification</i> systems, phased or partial projects, flood studies or mapping, <i>generators for non-critical facilities and stand-alone generators</i> , response and communications equipment, <i>dry floodproofing of residential structures, projects addressing ecological issues, demolition/rebuild projects, projects that solely address a manmade hazard</i> |
| Project Requirements          | Projects must have a BCR of at least 1.0; projects should be technically feasible  | Projects must have a BCR of <i>1.0 or greater</i> ; projects <i>must</i> be technically feasible; <i>projects must not be located in a coastal barrier area; projects in special flood hazard area must meet flood insurance requirements prior to award</i>  |
| Engineering Technical Review  | Feasibility scored by evaluators in the National Evaluation  | Engineering Technical Review panel will score feasibility. Project sub-applications that are determined not to be feasible and/or ineffective at solving the problem for which they were designed may be removed from funding consideration.  |

## FY 2005 Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program Guidance Changes from FY 2003

| Area   | FY 2003   | FY 2005   |
|--|---|---|
| Benefit-Cost Technical Review                  | Not addressed in guidance. Benefit-Cost Technical Review panel “scored” the adequacy of a Benefit-Cost Analysis using a confidence factor which was then applied to the Applicant’s BCA to obtain a weighted benefit-cost ratio, which was used in the National Ranking. FEMA did not revise the BCA. | Benefit-Cost Technical Review panel may revise the BCA/BCR submitted by an Applicant/Sub-applicant when insufficient or conflicting information is provided in the project sub-application. If the Technical Review panel deems the BCA completely inadequate, the project will be removed from funding consideration. Projects with BCRs determined by the Benefit-Cost Technical Review panel as less than 1.0 will not be eligible for PDM funding |
| Environmental/Historic Preservation Compliance | Questions/requirements in Sections A-J  | Changes to questions/requirements for Sections A-J and additional questions/requirements in Section K   |
| National Ranking & Evaluation                  | BCR by hazard as 51 % of National Ranking Score; feasibility evaluated by National Evaluation panels  | Benefit-Cost Technical Review panel’s BCR by hazard and confidence in BCR as 21% each of National Ranking Score and are also factors in National Evaluation Score; Engineering Technical review panel’s engineering feasibility score included in both National Ranking and National Evaluation Scores  |
| Technical Assistance                           | Technical assistance available through Regions, e-Grants Help Desk, and Benefit-Cost Helpline.  | Technical assistance available through Regions, e-Grants Help Desk, and <i>Technical Assistance Helplines for engineering feasibility, Benefit-Cost Analysis, and Environmental/Historic Preservation compliance; additional guidance documents provided on PDM web page: Sample Planning Scope of Work, Sample Engineering Case Studies, and BCA Guidelines</i>  |
| Quarterly Performance Reports                  | Quarterly performance report questions not addressed in guidance  | Quarterly performance report questions included in guidance   |